

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/680,738	EDWARDS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David A. Lambertson	1636

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) David A. Lambertson. (3) _____.

(2) Michelle LaCointe. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 November 2003

Time: 2:30pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,10,11 and 17

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney/agent (henceforth Applicant) was contacted regarding the cancellation of the currently pending claims. The cancellation was required in order to obviate a technical error in Applicant's response. Specifically, the amendment was technically non-responsive because it did not comply with the Rules for Making Amendments to the claims; the amendment did not contain the markings to indicate where the amendments to the claims had been made. The Examiner indicated that, in order to avoid the issuance of a letter of Non-Responsiveness, Applicant could authorize an Examiner's Amendment cancelling the pending claims, and substituting them with an exact duplicate of former claims 1, 10, 11 and 17. This was done for bookkeeping purposes only, and does not reflect the cancellation or disclaimer of any of the subject matter in the former claims.